

International Journal of Modern Physics D
 © World Scientific Publishing Company

RELATIVISTIC JETS: OPEN PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES

ARIEH KÖNIGL

*Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics, The University of Chicago
 5640 S Ellis Ave, Chicago, IL 60637, USA
 akonigl@uchicago.edu*

Received Day Month Year

Revised Day Month Year

Communicated by Managing Editor

Outstanding questions in the study of relativistic jets in their various astrophysical settings are discussed in the context of a general dynamical model.

Keywords: astrophysical jets; MHD; relativity

1. Introduction

There are a number of possible approaches to how the key open questions in the study of high-energy phenomena in relativistic outflows can be articulated. The one adopted here seizes on the basic dynamical model that is commonly believed to account for the acceleration and collimation of relativistic jets as a useful framework for this discussion. I first present the main elements of this model in the context of the different astrophysical settings in which relativistic jets occur. I then apply this model to the interpretation of the observational data and consider how it might be further tested and refined. Finally, I review how the connection between accretion and outflows – a fundamental property of cosmic jets – is manifested in these sources.

The “canonical” relativistic jet sources encompass gamma-ray bursts (GRBs), active galactic nuclei (AGNs), and X-ray binaries (XRBs). The bulk Lorentz factors implicated in GRB outflows are deduced from arguments involving opacity to pair creation or electron scattering for the high-energy photons¹ and typically lie in the range $\Gamma \sim 10^2 - 10^3$ for long/soft bursts. A prominent recent example is GRB 080916C, for which $\Gamma > 600$ has been inferred in this way.² In the pre-*Swift* era, several well-studied sources appeared to exhibit panchromatic breaks in their afterglow light curves on time scales (at the source) of $\gtrsim 1$ day, from which characteristic jet opening half-angles $\theta_j \sim 2^\circ - 5^\circ$ have been deduced.³ However, *Swift*-era bursts have exhibited a more complex behavior that has cast some doubt on this interpretation.⁴ In fact, in some cases jet breaks were argued to have occurred on much shorter time scales,^{5–6} implying $\theta_j \lesssim 1^\circ$. GRB outflows are likely powered by the extraction of rotational energy from a newly formed stellar-mass black hole

or a rapidly rotating neutron star, or from a surrounding debris disk.

In the case of AGNs, jets are actually imaged in radio through X-ray wavelengths, and their relativistic motions in the blazar class of objects are inferred directly from apparent superluminal motions of radio emission features on scales $\lesssim 1$ pc. Typical apparent speeds are $v_{\text{apparent}}/c \sim 10$ although values as high as ~ 50 have been measured, and it is likely that the bulk Lorentz factors are of the same order.⁷ These inferences are consistent with the values ($\Gamma \gtrsim 50$) deduced from pair-opacity arguments in the BL Lac objects PKS 2155-304 and Mrk 501 on the basis of the rapid (3 – 5 min) TeV-flux variability that they exhibited,⁸ although in these particular sources the radio emission knots have much lower apparent speeds and the implied bulk Lorentz factors may not be representative of the jet as a whole.^{9–10} Although AGN jets evidently also contain a nonrelativistic outflow component, there are indications that the relativistic component persists to large (kpc to Mpc) scales. These include the measurement of apparent superluminal motions at a projected distance of at least 150 pc in the 3C 120 jet,¹¹ the results of spectral modeling of the lobes of powerful radio sources, which suggest that the flow might be decelerating from relativistic speeds in the jet termination shock,¹² and the detection of extended X-ray emission in quasar jets (if interpreted as beamed, inverse-Compton scattered, cosmic-microwave-background radiation; see Ref. 13).

Apparent superluminal radio-component motions are also detected in X-ray emitting neutron-star and black-hole binaries, and although the typical speeds ($\sim 2 - 5c$) appear to be lower than those of AGNs, a value $\geq 12c$ has already been measured in Cir X-1 (a neutron-star binary; Ref. 14). In all these astrophysical realizations of a collimated relativistic outflow it is believed that a *magnetic field* provides the most plausible means of extracting rotational energy from the source (a black hole, neutron star, or accretion disk). A magnetic field (especially if it assumes a large-scale, ordered form) can also naturally guide, collimate, and accelerate these flows.¹⁵ However, thermal energy may contribute to the jet acceleration in GRB sources (through neutrino emission from the disk) and (in the case of long/soft bursts that originate in collapsed massive stars) to the re-acceleration of shocked jet material when it emerges from the progenitor star.

2. Magnetic Acceleration and Collimation of Relativistic Outflows

The dynamical model adopted in the ensuing discussion is based on exact (axisymmetric) solutions to the equations of special-relativistic, ideal magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) obtained in semi-analytic form (assuming time independence and employing radial self-similarity) and through multi-scale numerical simulations that attain a quasi-steady state.^{16–23} For definiteness, it is assumed that the outflow originates in an accretion disk, but a flow that taps instead the rotational energy of the central compact object would be qualitatively similar. As the bulk of the jet acceleration generally occurs at large distances from the origin (see Sec. 2.1), the effects of the central source's gravity can be neglected. However, the details

of the flow behavior in the immediate vicinity of the compact object may require a fully general-relativistic treatment.²⁶ The disk is assumed to be threaded by a large-scale, ordered magnetic field with an “even” symmetry (i.e. having only a z component at the midplane, using cylindrical coordinates r, ϕ, z), although in principle a small-scale, tangled field could also accelerate and collimate the flow.^{24–25} The field transfers angular momentum and energy from the accretion flow to the jet. The outflow is envisioned to be Poynting flux-dominated at its base, with the acceleration effected through the gradual transformation of magnetic energy into kinetic energy as the jet propagates away from the origin.

2.1. General characteristics

For the steady-state problem one jointly solves the Bernoulli and transfield (Grad-Shafranov) equations, representing, respectively, the force balance along and across poloidal streamlines. The detailed properties of the derived solutions depend on the particulars of the boundary conditions (for example, the distributions of magnetic flux and angular velocity at the source). However, when one follows the solutions to sufficiently large scales (the “asymptotic” regime) one can identify several generic properties of such flows. In particular, it is found that the magnetic acceleration mechanism is quite efficient, typically leading to a rough equipartition between the Poynting and kinetic-energy fluxes. The bulk of the acceleration is due to the gradient along the flow of the magnetic pressure associated with the azimuthal field component (B_ϕ). MHD acceleration is in general spatially extended, with the bulk of the increase of Γ occurring over distances that are much larger than the characteristic scale of a purely hydrodynamical (i.e. thermal) acceleration (which is of the order of the size of the region where the accelerated gas is initially confined).

The magnetic acceleration process is intimately tied to the shape of the poloidal field lines, which needs to be derived (using the Grad-Shafranov equation) simultaneously with the kinematic properties of the flow (obtained from the Bernoulli equation). In particular, in order for the flow to accelerate, the transverse distance between neighboring field lines must increase faster than their cylindrical radius. This can occur naturally in current-carrying jets, which develop a cylindrical core (due to compression by the B_ϕ hoop stress) even as the outer parts of the flow collimate more slowly. The fact that magnetic acceleration and collimation go hand in hand is expressed by the following general asymptotic result: $\Gamma \tan \theta_v = 1/\sqrt{b-1}$, where $\theta_v \equiv \arctan(dr/dz)$ is the local opening half-angle of the magnetic flux surface and the parameter b describes the local field-line shape ($z \propto r^b$, with $1 < b \leq 2$). This implies that $\Gamma \tan \theta_v \approx \Gamma \theta_v$ is usually $\simeq 1$ for “collimation accelerated” jets.^{22–23}

The asymptotic Lorentz factor $\Gamma(\theta)$ of the model jets typically peaks away from the axis. This is because the acceleration is due mainly to the gradient along the flow of the magnetic pressure associated with B_ϕ , and B_ϕ vanishes on the axis by symmetry. However, the kinetic power per unit solid angle $\epsilon(\theta)$ usually does peak at $\theta \approx 0$, reflecting the higher density attained in the collimated core. These generic

distributions are quite distinct from those commonly adopted in phenomenological jet models — for example, the “universal” model of GRB outflows ($\epsilon \propto \theta^{-2}$) and the “hollow cone” model (in which both $\Gamma(\theta)$ and $\epsilon(\theta)$ peak away from the axis).

2.2. *Confinement and collimation*

The collimation by the magnetic hoop stress of the innermost streamlines of a current-carrying jet relative to the outer streamlines represents the *self-collimation* property of magnetized outflows. However, a magnetized jet *cannot* be “self-confined”: confinement requires an ambient (thermal, magnetic, or ram) pressure.

The spatial distribution of the confining external pressure (e.g. $p_{\text{ext}}(z) \propto z^{-\alpha}$) determines the shape of the flow boundary (e.g. $z \propto r^\beta$) and hence the acceleration efficiency (see Sec. 2.1). The correspondence between the exponents α and β can be summarized as follows (see Refs. 27, 22 and 23):

- (i) $\alpha < 2 \Leftrightarrow \beta = 4/\alpha > 2$
- (ii) $\alpha = 2 \Leftrightarrow 1 < \beta \leq 2$
- (iii) $\alpha > 2 \Leftrightarrow \beta = 1$ (asymptotically) ,

where the specific value of β for $\alpha = 2$ is determined by the normalization of p_{ext} (i.e. by its magnitude at the base of the flow and not just by the value of its power-law exponent). These relationships demonstrate that efficiently accelerating jets are characterized by paraboloidal streamlines.

In order for the bulk of the flow to be efficiently accelerated there has to be *causal connectivity* across the flow: the inner and outer streamlines must be able to communicate (through the propagation of fast-magnetosonic waves) on the radial expansion time. Causal connectivity *cannot* be maintained if $\alpha > 2$: in that case the boundary asymptotically approaches a conical shape — corresponding to “free” (ballistic) expansion — and significant acceleration occurs only near the axis. Notwithstanding this conclusion, a magnetized relativistic jet can undergo significant acceleration if it loses pressure support (i.e. α increases from a value ≤ 2 to a value > 2) when it is already super-fast-magnetosonic.²⁸ This acceleration is effected by a rarefaction wave that communicates the loss of pressure support at the jet boundary to the gas in its interior,²⁹ although the “rarefaction acceleration” process can also be described in terms of the transverse distance between neighboring field lines increasing faster than their cylindrical radius — just like the “collimation acceleration” mechanism discussed in Sec. 2.1. Because of the way that velocities add in special relativity, the transverse acceleration induced by a rarefaction wave that propagates into an already relativistic flow can lead to a significant boost in the jet Lorentz factor. Although this mechanism is applicable also in the purely hydrodynamical case, it is particularly effective when the flow is magnetized.^{30–31}

External confinement is especially important for relativistic flows since, as Γ becomes $\gg 1$, the increased inertia and the growth of the electric force (which nearly cancels the transverse magnetic force) reduce the collimation efficiency. One possi-

ble confining agent is a *disk wind*, which could itself be driven hydromagnetically. This leads naturally to a *two-component* jet model, with a fast, narrow “spine” surrounded by a wider, slower, outflow. The fast component could be associated with the central object – for example, a Blandford-Znajek jet from the black-hole ergosphere³² — or else it could correspond to the innermost disk outflow. In the case of GRBs, the disk outflow could itself be relativistic ($\Gamma \gtrsim 10$) and might account for the bulk of the afterglow emission.^{33–35} In the case of AGNs, this type of model has long been advocated^{36–37} given that distinct relativistic and non-relativistic outflow components are directly observed. The relative contribution of two such components – attributed to the black hole and disk, respectively – is one possible explanation of the FR I/FR II dichotomy of extragalactic radio sources.³⁸ A potential consistency check of this hypothesis might be a search for broad iron lines in the X-ray spectra of FR II galaxies, from which a high rotation parameter for the central black hole might be inferred.³⁹ The practical implementation of such a test would, however, be challenging.^{40–41}

3. Confrontation of the Model with Observations

3.1. GRB sources

Ideal-MHD numerical simulations of magnetically accelerated jets²² indicate that GRB outflows can attain Lorentz factors $\Gamma \gtrsim 10^2$ on scales $\sim 10^{10} - 10^{12}$ cm, consistent with the possibility that long/soft GRB jets are accelerated within the envelopes of collapsing massive stars (which provide the requisite confinement). It is furthermore found that $\Gamma \gtrsim 30$ (a fiducial lower limit on the Lorentz factor in short/hard GRB jets; Ref. 42) can be attained on scales $\sim 9 \times 10^8 - 3 \times 10^{10}$ cm, consistent with the possibility that in this case the confinement is provided instead by a moderately relativistic wind from a central accretion disk that forms during a binary (two neutron stars or neutron-star/black-hole) merger. If the initial magnetizations of short/hard and long/soft GRB outflows are comparable, this scenario provides a plausible explanation of the finding (from the best available current data) that short/hard GRB jets are on average less relativistic than the ones associated with long/soft GRBs, and it leads to the prediction that short/hard GRB outflows should also be less well collimated, on average, than their long/soft GRB counterparts.

The relation $\Gamma\theta_v \approx 1$ obtained for the “collimation acceleration” mechanism implies $\theta_v \lesssim 1^\circ$ for $\Gamma \gtrsim 100$. As noted in Sec. 1, this is consistent with the inferences from some early-afterglow observations but it does not fit the pre-*Swift* standard model, in which $\Gamma\theta_v \gg 1$ is deduced from apparent panchromatic breaks in the afterglow light curve at later times. In the case of long/soft GRBs, the latter behavior can be attributed to the “rarefaction acceleration” mechanism, which is likely to operate when the outflow becomes unconfined upon emerging from the envelope of the progenitor star.^{28–29} Specifically, if the flow arrives at the stellar surface with $\Gamma \gtrsim 10^2$ and $\Gamma\theta_v \approx 1$, the “rarefaction acceleration” mechanism could increase Γ by a factor of a few (with θ_v also increasing, but by no more than $\sim 1/\Gamma$). It is unclear

how this scenario could accommodate very early jet breaks, although further observations are needed to verify that such breaks really exist. Given that short/hard GRB outflows evidently do not propagate through a stellar envelope, the above mechanism is probably not relevant to these sources. This picture therefore leads to the prediction that there should be few (if any) “latish” jet breaks in the afterglows of short/hard GRBs, which could be tested as more such afterglows are observed. Yet another consistency check arises from the findings that rarefaction acceleration is most effective in highly magnetized jets and that the latter are unlikely to form a hot cocoon of shocked gas as they advance toward the stellar surface.⁴³ the above picture may thus be incompatible with models⁴⁴ that attribute some of the emission properties of a source like GRB 080916C to the presence of such a cocoon. In contrast with the magnetic acceleration scenario, late-time jet breaks are not an issue for the fireball model, in which there is no inherent upper bound on $\Gamma\theta_v$.

3.2. *AGN jets*

A growing body of data indicates that relativistic AGN jets undergo the bulk of their acceleration on spatial scales not much smaller than ~ 0.1 pc, which are much larger than the characteristic scales predicted by purely hydrodynamical models. In particular, the absence of bulk-Comptonization spectral signatures in blazars implies that Lorentz factors $\gtrsim 10$ must be attained on scales not much smaller than $\sim 10^{17}$ cm.⁴⁵ This conclusion is supported by evidence from radio VLBI observations for ongoing acceleration of distinct outflow components on scales of $\sim 1 - 10$ pc in many blazar jets.⁴⁶ Observations of jets in sources like M87 indicate⁴⁷ that the bulk of the flow collimation occurs on similar, comparatively large scales. Both of these findings are consistent with the predictions of the ideal-MHD acceleration model.⁴⁸

The superluminal radio components in blazar jets often appear to move on helical paths. In the magnetic acceleration model, these observations can be interpreted in terms of distinct outflow components that move along helical field lines,⁴⁹ with any given component conceivably corresponding to an ejection episode along an isolated magnetic flux bundle that threads the nuclear accretion disk. This picture could be tested against alternative interpretations (involving unstable fluid modes, source precession, etc.) by applying all the available kinematic constraints from the VLBI observations. Valuable additional constraints could be provided by the radiative properties of the jets, including their radio and higher-energy emission,^{50–51} linear and circular polarization,^{52–53} and Faraday rotation measure.⁵⁴

4. Radiative Effects

The nature of the radiative processes that give rise to the observed emission from relativistic jets is clearly relevant to our ability to properly interpret these sources. In fact, the lingering uncertainty on this matter underlies some of the key remaining open questions in this field, including the origin of the prompt and afterglow

emission in GRBs, the origin of the highest-energy γ -rays measured in GRBs and in AGNs, and the origin of the extended X-ray emission from quasar jets. As discussed below, these questions are closely linked to the issue of the jet dynamics, both because the dynamical framework influences which emission process dominates and because some of the radiative effects have a direct dynamical impact on the flow. This linkage can be manifested at the origin (e.g. when neutrino emission from the accretion disk leads to an initially “hot” GRB outflow) or as the jet makes its way out (e.g. the inverse-Compton interaction between an AGN jet and the ambient radiation field), and it might even represent a fundamental connection between the acceleration and emission mechanisms (as when magnetic energy dissipation along the flow plays a major role in both of these processes).

4.1. *Thermal acceleration effects*

If the enthalpy per rest-mass energy at the origin is $\gg 1$ then the initial acceleration will be thermal, but the magnetic field will still guide the flow if the Poynting/enthalpy flux ratio is > 1 (or even if this ratio is initially < 1 so long as the flow remains sub-Alfvénic; Ref. 18). Depending on the confining pressure distribution and the adiabatic index of the gas, the enthalpy flux in the thermal acceleration region could either go only into kinetic energy or else be partially converted into Poynting flux (thereby contributing to the jet acceleration further out).²² One effect of such added thermal acceleration would be to shift the angular distribution of the jet kinetic power toward the axis, but a clearer observational diagnostic of a “fireball” component would be the presence of a photospheric thermal emission component in the spectrum.⁵⁵ Such a component is evidently missing in many GRBs (including GRB 080916C; Ref. 56) but appears to be present in certain cases (e.g. GRB 090902B; Ref. 57). It may be possible to explain this range of behaviors within the framework of the basic dynamical model in terms of a variation in the enthalpy/rest-mass and enthalpy/Poynting flux ratios among different sources.

4.2. *Interaction with the ambient radiation field*

Focusing on the AGN case,⁵⁸ possible sources of ambient photons include the nuclear disk emission, scattered or reprocessed disk radiation, broad-line region emission, and the microwave background. The most direct effect is inverse-Compton (i.c.) scattering by electrons in the jet, which gives rise to the so-called “external” i.c. spectral component. For example, it has been argued⁵⁹ that the apparent γ -ray spectral separation within *Fermi* blazars between BL Lac objects (which have hard spectra) and flat-spectrum radio quasars (which have soft high-energy spectra) could be attributed to the relative strength of this component in these two types of sources. Furthermore, as already noted in Sec. 3.2, the constraint provided by the predicted strength of this component places a lower bound on the spatial extent of the jet acceleration region. This limit could be sharpened by incorporating radiation drag and i.c. cooling explicitly into MHD simulations of relativistic jets.

On the basis of taking into account also the possible conversion of upscattered photons into e^+e^- pairs through photon-photon collisions, it was argued^{60–61} that a significant fraction of the kinetic energy of AGN jets could potentially be converted into high-energy emission. However, more elaborate numerical simulations are needed to verify the viability of this *photon breeding* mechanism. In particular, two key assumptions of the model, involving the dynamical response of the ambient medium and the nature of its postulated magnetization, require further scrutiny.

4.3. *Uncertainties involving the emission mechanism*

Concentrating on GRB sources, I address, in turn, questions about the prompt and the afterglow emission components. It is noteworthy that the origin of the prompt high-energy emission is still being debated: What is the origin of the nonthermal component (synchrotron? jitter radiation? synchrotron self-Compton?), and is there also a photospheric thermal component present? Furthermore, the popular internal-shocks model for the prompt emission has been challenged in several important ways, including by indications from *Swift* and *Fermi* measurements that the emission region is much farther from the origin ($\gtrsim 10^{15} - 10^{16}$ cm; Refs. 62 and 56) than what is expected in this scenario. One possible alternative to this model is relativistic turbulence (with random Lorentz factors ~ 10 in the comoving frame), as originally proposed in the context of a force-free electrodynamics ($\rho_e \mathbf{E} + \mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B} = 0$) outflow model.⁶³ GRB 080319B may be an example of a source where the data are consistent with this picture but not with the internal-shocks interpretation.⁶⁴

It is interesting to note in this connection that localized relativistic emission regions that are distinct from the bulk jet outflow have also been proposed to account for the TeV variability in blazars.^{9–10} The latter proposals were formulated in the context of the MHD dynamical model, which suggests that a viable alternative to the internal-shocks model for GRBs need not require replacing the MHD description by the force-free electrodynamic (also referred to as the *magnetodynamic*) model. Magnetodynamics is a limiting case of MHD when the matter inertia can be neglected, and it allows one to derive the asymptotic parameter scalings of the full model (Refs. 27 and 22); however, one cannot explicitly calculate the jet velocity or the magnetic-to-kinetic energy conversion efficiency in this approximation.

Even if the MHD picture remains applicable, *ideal* MHD may not be. Highly relativistic Poynting flux-dominated outflows may be inherently dissipative,¹⁵ and this could lead to the direct conversion of magnetic energy to radiation in both GRB and AGN jets.^{65–68} However, the specifics of the process by which magnetic dissipation leads to particle acceleration and nonthermal emission are not yet well understood and would need to be considered in relation to alternative particle-acceleration mechanisms that might operate in the jet, including processes that tap into the cross-flow velocity shear (Refs. 37 and 69). Furthermore, this process might occur under certain constraints (for example, the conservation of magnetic helicity) that could limit the amount of dissipated energy and affect the internal magnetic

field structure.⁷⁰

Magnetic energy dissipation naturally creates a magnetic pressure gradient along the flow, and it was proposed⁷¹ that even on its own (i.e. without incorporating the acceleration that occurs in the absence of dissipation) this effect could efficiently accelerate the jet to relativistic speeds. However, so far this process has been modeled only in an approximate manner, using strong simplifications: it needs to be studied under more realistic assumptions with the help of *resistive* relativistic-MHD codes. It was also suggested that the internal magnetic dissipation might be induced by current-driven instabilities (in particular the $m = 1$ kink),⁷² but the results of recent MHD simulations indicate that the overall dynamics of successfully launched relativistic jets is not strongly affected by such instabilities^{73–74} and that the associated magnetic dissipation is correspondingly modest.⁷⁵ There is observational evidence for strong dissipation in initially Poynting flux-dominated outflows from pulsars, but how exactly this is achieved (the “ σ problem” in pulsar-wind theory) and whether efficient dissipation in relativistic jet sources requires a similar setup are still open questions.

The origin of the afterglow emission also remains a puzzle. In particular, the number of distinct outflow components observed at any given phase of the afterglow evolution and the relative contributions of the synchrotron and i.c. processes at any given spectral regime are still open questions. Recent *Fermi* observations were interpreted as indicating that the high-energy ($\gtrsim 10^2$ MeV) photons are produced by the synchrotron process in the forward shock that propagates into the ambient medium and that this is also the source of the late ($\gtrsim 1$ day) afterglow emission but *not* of the $< 10^2$ MeV photons from the early afterglow.^{76–77} In this picture, the inferred magnetic field in the emission region is consistent with a shock-compressed interstellar field, which mitigates the difficulty of explaining the much stronger magnetic field deduced in the synchrotron interpretation of the $< 10^2$ MeV early afterglow.⁷⁸ The latter field can be naturally explained if the early afterglow emission originates in the reverse shock that is driven into the (likely magnetized) GRB ejecta, and this picture can in fact account for many observed afterglow features.^{79–80} An important constraint on this scenario is provided by the fact that, if the jet remains too strongly magnetized at the location of the early-afterglow emission, the reverse shock may be too weak to account for the observed radiation.⁸¹ A further challenge is presented by the evidence from *Swift* observations that the optical and X-ray afterglow light curves arise in two distinct emission components.^{82–83} A complete model would need to put all these pieces of the puzzle in place.

5. The Accretion–Outflow (Disk–Jet) Connection

It has been known for some time now that the same scaling relation between the radio (L_R) and X-ray (L_X) luminosities, normalized by the black-hole mass M , applies in both AGNs and galactic black-hole XRBs:^{84–85}

$$\log L_R \approx 0.60 \log L_X + 0.78 \log M + 7.33 .$$

The X-ray and radio luminosities can be regarded as proxies for the accretion and outflow powers, respectively. Interestingly, a positive correlation between the jet power and the luminosity of the accretion disk is found also in broad-line blazars when the γ -ray luminosity (inferred from *Swift* and *Fermi* data) is used as a proxy for the jet power.⁸⁶ Black-hole XRBs exhibit this relation in the low/hard state; the radio emission is quenched when the X-ray luminosity grows to $\lesssim 10\%$ L_{Edd} and the source enters the high/soft state. A similar quenching of the radio emission is inferred in AGNs, with sources such as Narrow-Line Seyfert 1 galaxies possibly corresponding to the high/soft state.⁸⁷

The low/hard state in galactic black-hole binaries has been interpreted as an accretion phase during which steady-state jets carry away most of the liberated power.⁸⁸ Transient jet outflows may occur at higher accretion rates during the very-high (or steep-power-law) state, of which powerful radio-jet sources may be the AGN analogs.⁸⁹ It was proposed that jet dominance during the low/hard state might be related to the formation of a large-scale poloidal field configuration, although the details of this process and whether it is even the correct explanation are still open questions. Compatibility with spectral models, which indicate that the hard state requires a comparatively weak magnetic field in the X-ray emission region and that the soft state is actually consistent with a comparatively strong field,⁹⁰ would need to be part of the comprehensive picture that eventually emerges for these sources.

Over the last several years, various studies have attempted to refine and extend the empirical results for XRBs and to further clarify the analogies between the accretion states of XRBs and AGNs (see Refs. 91 and 92 for reviews). Furthermore, multi-frequency monitoring of the radio galaxy 3C 120 succeeded in uncovering the same type of anti-correlated X-ray and radio variability that is exhibited during radio-component ejections in XRBs.⁹³ In considering these findings, it may be useful to recall that a strong accretion–outflow connection is indicated in all cosmic jet sources (including young stellar objects) but that its precise nature remains a puzzle. Relativistic jet sources could potentially provide new insights into this problem. For example, the extent to which the outflow is influenced by the properties of the central object (rather than by those of the accretion flow alone) is one important issue that could be explicitly addressed in this case. In particular, one could attempt to clarify the role of the black-hole spin in driving XRB outflows by comparing the properties of neutron-star and black-hole systems⁹⁴ and then use the established analogies with AGNs to assess the applicability of the results to extragalactic jets.

References

1. Y. Lithwick and R. Sari, *ApJ* **555** (2001) 540.
2. A. A. Abdo *et al.*, *Science* **323** (2009) 1688.
3. A. Zeh, S. Klose and D. A. Kann, *ApJ* **637** (2006) 889.
4. J. L. Racusin *et al.*, *ApJ* **698** (2009) 43.
5. A. Kamble *et al.*, *MNRAS* **394** (2009) 214.
6. A. Panaitescu, *MNRAS* **379** (2007) 331.

7. M. L. Lister *et al.*, *AJ* **138** (2009) 1874.
8. M. C. Begelman, A. C. Fabian and M. J. Rees, *MNRAS* **384** (2008) L19.
9. G. Ghisellini *et al.*, *MNRAS* **393** (2009) L16.
10. D. Giannios, D. A. Uzdensky and M. C. Begelman, *MNRAS* **395** (2009) L29.
11. R. C. Walker *et al.*, *ApJ* **556** (2001) 756.
12. M. Georganopoulos and D. Kazanas, *ApJ* **589** (2003) L5.
13. D. M. Worrall, *A&ARv* **17** (2009) 1.
14. V. Tudose *et al.*, *MNRAS* **390** (2008) 447.
15. R. D. Blandford, To the Lighthouse, in *Lighthouses of the Universe*, eds. M. Gilfanov *et al.* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002), p. 381.
16. Z.-Y. Li, T. Chiueh and M. C. Begelman, *ApJ* **394** (1992), 459.
17. J. Contopoulos, *ApJ* **432** (1994) 508.
18. N. Vlahakis and A. Königl, *ApJ* **596** (2003) 1080.
19. N. Vlahakis and A. Königl, *ApJ* **596** (2003) 1104.
20. V. S. Beskin and E. E. Nokhrina, *MNRAS* **367** (2006) 375.
21. S. S. Komissarov *et al.*, *MNRAS* **380** (2007) 51.
22. S. S. Komissarov *et al.*, *MNRAS* **394** (2009) 1182.
23. Y. Lyubarsky, *ApJ* **698** (2009) 1570.
24. S. Heinz and M. C. Begelman, *ApJ* **535** (2000) 104.
25. L.-X. Li, *ApJ* **564** (2002) 108.
26. M. Lyutikov, *MNRAS* **396** (2009) 1545.
27. A. Tchekhovskoy, J. C. McKinney and R. Narayan, *MNRAS* **388** (2008) 551.
28. A. Tchekhovskoy, R. Narayan and J. M. McKinney, Magnetohydrodynamic simulations of gamma-ray burst jets: beyond the progenitor star, to appear in *ApJL*.
29. S. Komissarov, N. Vlahakis and A. Königl, Rarefaction acceleration of ultrarelativistic jets in gamma-ray burst sources, to appear in *MNRAS*.
30. M. A. Aloy and L. Rezzolla, *ApJ* **640** (2006) L115.
31. Y. Mizuno *et al.*, *ApJ* **672** (2008) 72.
32. A. Levinson and D. Eichler, *PhRvL* **85** (2000) 236.
33. F. Peng, A. Königl and J. Granot, *ApJ* **626** (2005) 966.
34. J. Granot, A. Königl and T. Piran, *MNRAS* **370** (2006) 1946.
35. J. L. Racusin *et al.*, *Nature* **455** (2008) 183.
36. H. Sol, G. Pelletier and E. Asséo, *MNRAS* **237** (1989) 411.
37. L. Stawarz and M. Ostrowski, *ApJ* **578** (2002) 763.
38. M. Sikora, L. Stawarz and J.-P. Lasota, *ApJ* **658** (2007) 815.
39. A. C. Fabian *et al.*, *PASP* **112**, 1145.
40. D. R. Ballantyne, *MPLA* **22** (2007) 2397.
41. J. Larsson *et al.*, *MNRAS* **388** (2008) 1037.
42. E. Nakar, *PhR* **442** (2007) 166.
43. S. S. Komissarov and M. V. Barkov, *MNRAS* **382** (2007) 1089.
44. K. Tome, X.-F. Wu and P. Mészáros, *ApJ* **707** (2009) 1404.
45. M. Sikora *et al.*, *ApJ* **625** (2005) 72.
46. D. C. Homan *et al.*, *ApJ* **706** (2009) 1253.
47. W. Junor, J. A. Biretta and M. Livio, *Nature* **401** (1999) 891.
48. N. Vlahakis and A. Königl, *ApJ* **605** (2004) 656.
49. M. Camenzind and M. Krockenberger, *A&A* **255** (1992) 59.
50. J. A. Zensus, *ARA&A* **35** (1997) 607.
51. A. P. Marscher *et al.*, *Nature* **452** (2008) 966.
52. M. Lyutikov, V. I. Pariev and D. C. Gabuzda, *MNRAS* **360** (2005) 869.
53. D. C. Gabuzda *et al.*, *MNRAS* **384** (2008) 1003.

54. A. E. Broderick and A. Loeb, *ApJ* **703** (2009) L104.
55. F. Daigne and R. Mochkovitch, *MNRAS* **336** (2002) 1271.
56. B. Zhang and A. Pe'er, *ApJ* **700** (2009) L65.
57. F. Ryde *et al.*, *ApJ* **709** (2010) L172.
58. M. Sikora, M. C. Begelman and M. J. Rees, *ApJ* **421** (1994) 153.
59. G. Ghisellini, L. Maraschi and F. Tavecchio, *MNRAS* **396** (2009) L105.
60. B. E. Stern and J. Poutanen, *MNRAS* **372** (2006) 1217.
61. B. E. Stern and J. Poutanen, *MNRAS* **383** (2008) 1695.
62. M. Lyutikov, *MNRAS* **369** (2006) L5.
63. M. Lyutikov and R. D. Blandford, *arXiv:astro-ph/0312347* (2003).
64. P. Kumar and R. Narayan, *MNRAS* **395** (2009) 472.
65. V. V. Usov, *MNRAS* **267** (1994) 1035.
66. C. Thompson, *MNRAS* **270** (1994) 480.
67. A. R. Choudhuri and A. Königl, *ApJ* **310** (1986) 96.
68. M. M. Romanova and R. V. E. Lovelace, *ApJ* **475** (1997) 97.
69. M. Lyutikov and R. Ouyed, *A&Ph* **27** (2007) 473.
70. A. Königl and A. R. Choudhuri, *ApJ* **289** (1985) 173.
71. G. Drenkhahn and H. Spruit, *A&A* **391** (2002) 1141.
72. D. Giannios and H. C. Spruit, *A&A* **450** (2006) 887.
73. Y. Mizuno, P. Hardee and K.-I. Nishikawa, *ApJ* **662** (2007) 835.
74. J. C. McKinney and R. D. Blandford, *MNRAS* **394** (2009) L126.
75. R. Moll, H. C. Spruit and M. Obergaulinger, *A&A* **492** (2008) 621.
76. P. Kumar and R. Barniol Duran, *MNRAS* **400** (2009) L75.
77. P. Kumar and R. Barniol Duran, External forward shock origin of high-energy emission for three GRBs detected by Fermi, to appear in *MNRAS*.
78. M. V. Medvedev and A. Loeb, *ApJ* **526** (1999) 697.
79. F. Genet, F. Daigne and R. Mochkovitch, *MNRAS* **381** (2007) 732.
80. X. L. Uhm and A. M. Beloborodov, *ApJ* **665** (2007) L93.
81. P. Mimica, D. Giannios and M. A. Aloy, *A&A* **4949** (2009) 879.
82. G. Ghisellini *et al.*, *MNRAS* **393** (2009) 253.
83. M. Nardini *et al.*, Testing a new view of gamma-ray burst afterglows, to appear in *MNRAS*.
84. A. Merloni, S. Heinz and T. Di Matteo, *MNRAS* **345** (2003) 1057.
85. H. Falcke, E. Körding and S. Markoff, *A&A* **414** (2004) 895.
86. G. Ghisellini *et al.*, General physical properties of bright Fermi blazars, to appear in *MNRAS*.
87. J. E. Greene, L. C. Ho and J. S. Ulvestad, *ApJ* **636** (2006) 56.
88. M. Livio, J. E. Pringle and A. R. King, *ApJ* **593** (2003) 184.
89. S. Jester, *ApJ* **625** (2005) 667.
90. J. Poutanen and I. Vurm, *ApJ* **690** (2009) L97.
91. R. Fender, 'Disc-jet' coupling in black-hole X-ray binaries and active galactic nuclei, to appear in *The Jet Paradigm*, Lect. Notes Phys., Vol. 794 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010).
92. I. M. McHardy, X-ray variability of AGN and relationship to galactic black-hole binary systems, to appear in *The Jet Paradigm*, Lect. Notes Phys., Vol. 794 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010).
93. R. Chatterjee *et al.*, *ApJ* **704** (2009) 1689.
94. S. Migliari and R. P. Fender, *MNRAS* **366** (2006) 79.